

11 responsive to said database, distributing user
12 identifiers selectively based upon security domain
13 through auto generation, directory lookup or user
14 prompt.

REMARKS

The above amendment and these remarks are responsive to the communication from Examiner S. Pannala dated 25 Aug 2003.

Claims 1-22 are in the case, none having been allowed.

Drawings

Applicants note with appreciation that the Examiner has approved the "proposed" drawing change. Applicants provided the corrected drawings in response to the previous Office Action.

Claims 1-2, 4-22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over McGee (US Patent 6,393,468) in view of Sutter (US Patent 6,446,092).

Claim 3 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over McGee, in view Sutter and in view of Forbes et al. (U. S. Patent 6,381,742). Claim 3 depends from claim 2.

Applicants invention is about offline web applications. That is, applicants provide to client browsers multiple offline subscriptions that replicate securely, each subscription including client-side runtimes and frameworks that let a user interact with the application of the website when unplugged, that is, offline with respect to the website, in a manner that is secure and that has data-integrity through replication and synchronization.

With McGee, an end user can only use the web experience with the browser connected to the net. Unplug the net connection, and the user is unable to function. The browser in McGee has a cache of read-only pages, none of which execute the server's database or page-transition logic. So,

unplugged, the user is unable to interact with the application of the website.

Applicants define "subscription" at page 24, lines 11-17 as follows:

"A subscription is... a secured (that is, ACL protected) database or collection of databases containing off-line web applications with synchronization schedules and with which an authorized user may interact, either on-line or with an off-line instantiation."

There is no teaching in McGee of a "subscription", as applicants have defined the term.

The Examiner relies on Sutter for a teaching of the concept of subscription, stating:

"Sutter teaches as Independent Distributed Database System (IDDS) work offline with local data and all application transactions are against a local database. Sites sharing the same data synchronize their changes periodically in the background and changes made at one

site become visible to all other interested sites (at Fig. 1, col. 10, lines 21-33)...." [Response to Arguments, Office Action, page 8.]

Sutter teaches that his system is peer to peer, with each node accessing other nodes for replication at the same privilege level. This is what Sutter teaches:

"...all sites in the IDDB, i.e. nodes, are peers and no site acts as a server for another. Each site stores 'all and only' the data it needs. It is a feature of the present invention that users always work off-line with local data, and all application transactions are against a local database. Sites sharing the same data synchronize their changes periodically in the background and changes made at one site become visible to all the other interested sites. It is a feature of the IDDB database that there are no on-line or distributed application transactions, as all application transactions are local. There are network transactions, but they operate fully in the background and are not visible to the application, i.e. the user."

[Sutter, col. 10, lines 21-33.]

While Sutter is a peer to peer system, applicants' invention is not peer to peer, but rather master-slave. This is brought out in applicants' claims by reciting a server and a browser (that is, master and slave).

Sutter provides for a data replication and data access-control replication system only. Applicants' invention provides an application and application-environment replication system, built upon a data and data-access replication system. Again, the key distinction lies in the definition of subscription. If applicants' defined a subscription to be replicating chunk of access-controlled data, and only that, then Sutter would teach. But applicants' subscriptions are a logical grouping of data PLUS (a) application implementations (such as forms, views, agents, code routines) AND (b) application-instance security context (such as roles like manager/non-manager that the application logic responds to differently). Nothing in Sutter provides for delivering application implementation and security context along with the data. Applicants have amended all independent claims in the case to clarify this distinction.

The combination of Sutter and McGee does not account

for ways to setup, configure, and manage a web server. If applicants were to take all the web server implementation files, store them as data in IDDB, then IDDB could be used to replicate those files everywhere. But then what? Something still needs to treat those files as executables, unpack them, configure them, run them, administer them, and shut them down. Updates to subparts of the web server container and the web applications need to be replicated, added successfully to the existing configuration, version managed and administered. This is what applicants invention provides: an integrated means for transporting, unpacking, configuring, updating, administering a container and applications contained [See pages 22 and 23 of the specification.]

Applicants urge that claims 1-2 and 4-22 be allowed.

The McGee reference is about how a web server enforces logins and then uses those logins for optimizing its caching. The Sutter reference is about peer to peer replication of data. The Forbes references is about incremental installers of application logic using XML. None, separately or in combination teach applicants invention which provides subscriptions containing client-

side runtime and framework for a fully functioning offline server for offline operation of a client browser.

With respect to Forbes, Forbes teaches at Col. 12:29-14:3 a manifest for incremental installation of application logic onto a machine using XML and namespaces. There is no teaching of a "subscription" as that term has been defined by applicants in the amended parent claim and discussed previously with respect to McGee and Sutter.

Applicants urge that claim 3 also be allowed.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Applicants urge that the above amendments be entered and the case passed to issue with claims 1-22.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conversation with applicant(s) attorney could possibly facilitate prosecution of the case, he may be reached at the number noted below.

Sincerely,

C. J. Kraenzel, et al.

By



Shelley M. Beckstrand
Reg. No. 24,886

Date: 19 Dec 2003

Shelley M Beckstrand, P.C.
Attorney at Law
314 Main Street
Owego, NY 13827

Phone: (607) 687-9913
Cell: (607) 427-0802